

## **REMARKS**

### **Amendments and New Claims**

Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found, for example, on page 10, line 30.

Claim 6 is rewritten in independent form.

Support for new claim 21 can be found, for example, on page 11, lines 5-21.

Support for new claim 22 can be found, for example, on page 5, lines 26-29.

### **Rejections Under 35 USC 103**

The claims are rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Hanelt.

Hanelt does not teach or suggest a negative birefringent retardation film wherein the helical pitch of the LC material is 55 nm to < 100 nm as claimed in current claim 1. Thus, claim 1 and its dependent claims are not obvious for at least this reason.

Claim 6 is now in independent form having the same scope as when rejected. Hanelt does not teach or suggest combining a negative retardation film with a polarizer such that the director at the surface of said retardation film facing said polariser and the polarisation direction of said polariser are oriented at an angle of 30 to 60° relative to each other. Hanelt at column 9, lines 32-39 teaches the inclination angle of the mesogens within the retardation film relative to its surface. However, Hanelt does not provide any teaching about the angle of the surface director of the retardation film relative to another film, e.g., a polarizer. Thus, claim 6 and its dependent claims are not obvious for at least this reason.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908  
Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969  
Attorneys for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO  
& BRANIGAN, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400  
Arlington, VA 22201  
Direct Dial: 703-812-5331  
Facsimile: 703-243-6410  
Attorney Docket No.:MERCK-2965

Filed: August 25, 2006

K:\MERCK\2000 - 2999\2965\REPLY SEPT 06.DOC